



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/683,575	- -	10/09/2003	Dicle Ozis	245-66956	9457	
24197	7590	06/13/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
•		RKMAN, LLP	FREJD, RUSSE	FREJD, RUSSELL WARREN		
121 SW SAI SUITE 1600		IREEI	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
PORTLANI), OR 9	7204	2128			
				DATE MAILED: 06/13/2000	DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/683,575	OZIS ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Russell Frejd	2128
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was realiure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 Security</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under Experiments.	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-63 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-63 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the ore Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction.	vn from consideration. r election requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9.7.04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	

In re Application of: Ozis et al.

Examination of Application #10/683,575

1. Claims 1-63 of application 10/683,575, filed on 9-October-2003, are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 11, 14, 15, 16, 19, 22, 25, 26, 27, 29, 32, 35, 38, 39, 44, 46, 47, 53, 54, 55, 56 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being vague and indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, particularly:

In claim 3, "a heavily doped substrate". (emphasis added)

In claims 4, 15, 26 and 27, "a lightly doped substrate".

In claims 14, 16, 19, 22, 25, 44 and 56, "based on a simulation or a measurement".

In claims 39, "the **range** of contact sizes is from about 2.4 μ m to about 100 μ m", and 55, "an **area** between about 2.4 μ m to about 100 μ m". (Area should be in μ m²)

In claim 46, "values of x substantially equal to or greater then 10 μm".

In claims 1, 11, 29, 32, 35, 38, 44, 53 and 61, "associated with".

In claim 47, "is from about".

In claim 54, "is from substantially".

In re Application of: Ozis et al.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

- 3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:
 - Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
- 3.1 Claims 1-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The invention claims (claim 1 preamble), "A method of substrate modeling"; and more particularly, "A method for determining a scalable Z parameter for a contact in a substrate, wherein the scalable Z parameter is associated with a resistance between the contact and a groundplane." (claim 38 preamble)
- 3.2 MPEP Section 2106(IV)(B)(2)(b)(ii) provides that a statutory computer process is determined not by how the computer performs the process, but by what the computer does to achieve a practical application with a useful, concrete and tangible result. For example, a computer process that simply calculates a mathematical algorithm that models noise is nonstatutory, while a claimed process for digitally filtering noise employing the mathematical algorithm is statutory. The long line of cases in this area that are referred to in MPEP Section 2106(IV)(B)(2)(b)(ii) exemplify this requirement, by utilizing in the claim language, terms such as controlling, executing, changing and removing. In view of the aforementioned requirement, the Examiner respectfully contends that the claim language of independent claims 1, 29, 35, 38, 44, 53 and 61, do not claim a practical application with a tangible result, that language claiming:

(In claim 1) **determining** (emphasis added) scalable Z parameters associated with at least two substrate contacts; **constructing** a matrix of the scalable Z parameters for the at least

In re Application of: Ozis et al.

two substrate contacts; and **calculating** an inverse of the matrix to determine resistance values associated with the at least two substrate contacts.

3.3 For at least these reasons, the Examiner respectfully posits that the claims of the present invention do not meet the criteria for a statutory process. Accordingly, the claims are determined to be a method for determining a scalable Z parameter for a contact in a substrate, consisting solely of mathematical operations, converting one set of numbers into another set of numbers, whereby the method does not manipulate appropriate subject matter, and thus cannot constitute a statutory process (MPEP Section 2106(IV)(B)(2)(c)).

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4.1 Claims 1, 29, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the article authored by Chou et al., hereinafter Chou, entitled *Multilevel Integral Equation Methods* for the Extraction of Substrate Coupling Parameters in Mixed-Signal IC's.

Chou disclosed the invention as claimed, including: determining scalable Z parameters associated with at least two substrate contacts; constructing a matrix of the scalable Z parameters for the at least two substrate contacts; and calculating an inverse of the matrix to

In re Application of: Ozis et al.

determine resistance values associated with the at least two substrate contacts [p. 20, Section I. Introduction].

Claim Objections

5. Claims 2-28, 30-34 and 36-37 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Allowed Claims

6. Claims 38-63 are deemed allowable over the prior art of record at this time, pending resolution of any rejections noted above.

Response Guidelines

- 7. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).
- 7.1 Any response to the Examiner in regard to this non-final action should be

directed to: Russell Frejd, telephone number (571) 272-3779, Monday-Friday

from 0530 to 1400 ET, **or** the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah, telephone number (571) 272-2279. Inquires of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100

Group Receptionist (571) 272-2100.

mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

or faxed to: (571) 273-8300

Serial Number: 10/683,575

In re Application of: Ozis et al.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

Date: 27-March-2006

RUSSELL FREJD PRIMARY EXAMINER

RUSSELL FREJE